DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 410 CS 503 832

AUTHOR Arnett, Ronald C.
TITLE Dialogue in the Classroom.
PUB DATE Apr 82
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Milwaukee, WI, April 15-17, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; *Educational Philosophy; Higher Education; *Instructional Design; *Speech Communication; Speech Curriculum; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Teaching Methods; Teaching Styles
IDENTIFIERS *Buber (Martin)

ABSTRACT

Noting Martin Buber's rejection of both the permissive (individualistic) and the authoritative models of education and his dislike of clear epistemologies or systematic pedagogies, this paper examines Buber's work as an organized philosophical underpinning for dialogue in the classroom. The paper details Buber's approach to education as an alternative to the above mentioned extremes in sections that (1) discuss Buber's method of association with students and (2) describe his vision of what constitutes the educated person. The final section of the paper considers the implications of applying Buber's educational philosophy to speech communication instruction. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216410

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

DIALOGUE IN THE CLASSROOM

by

Ronald C. Arnett, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Speech Communication
St. Cloud State University
St. Cloud, MN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ronald C. Arnett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for:

Central States Speech Association
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
April, 1982

(Presented in honor of Dr. Paul Keller, professor emeritus, Manchester College, N. Manchester, Indiana.)

CS503832

DIALOGUE IN THE CLASSROOM

Sensitivity to the educative moment in the classroom has been detailed by philosophers such as John Dewey, psychologists such as Carl Rogers, theologians such as Martin Buber, and college presidents as distinguished as Robert Hutchins. I was fortunate enough to be exposed to the educational philosophy of each of these people through the instructive hand of Dr. Paul Keller at Manchester College. Of this impressive list of educators, I was most influenced by the work of Martin Buber. Thus, it seems appropriate and fitting to share my understanding of Buber's educational philosophy at this honoring of Paul's contribution to the dialogue between teacher and student and his contribution to the study of dialogue in the Speech Communication discipline.[1]

Before I venture into discussion of Buber as an educator, I wish to offer my heart-felt appreciation to Dr. Keller for his contribution to my personal and intellectual growth and his long-standing and continuing contribution to young people. His approach is dialogical and much akin to that of Buber. But he is very much his own person, just as he has encouraged his students to unfold not in his image, but in their own unique talents. Thus, with this paper and with my own commitment to students nourished by his model, I extend my thanks and admiration.

Introduction: Buber as Educator

Perhaps the most appropriate way to begin a description of Martin Buber as educator is with student response to his contribution. On Martin Buber's eighty-fifth birthday, a group of five hundred students at Hebrew University gathered in his honor. They awarded Buber with an honorary membership in

the Jewish Student Association. Aubrey Hodes' on-sight account of Buber's impromptu acceptance speech is indicative of Buber's enthusiasm for education and learning.

> "'There was a Dutch professor' (I knew he was thinking of Johan Huizinga) 'who wrote a book about the natural playing man--someone who enjoys play as an expression of freedom.' 'Well,' Buber said, 'perhaps we can also recognize what I would call the natural studying man--someone for whom learning and study are equally an expression of human freedom. This student man is someone who aspires to know the truth in order to erect upon it a structure worthy for people to inhabit. If this is your aspiration, I am delighted that you have made me a partner in it, by accepting me as a student in Jerusalem.'"[2]

Buber's love of the educational meeting was as clear to the students that gathered in celebration as it is to many who study his work today.[3] In an early article on Buber and education, Maurice Friedman describes the work of two English scholars that made his classic essay on education recorded in Between Man and Man, the center of their individual works. The authors, Sir Fred Clarke, Freedom in the Educative Society, and Sir Herbert Read, Education Through Art, were impressed by Buber's alternative to both permissive and imposed educational codes.

> He [Read] agrees with Buber and Clarke that it is not the free exercise of instinct that matters but the opposition that it encounters...According to Read, Buber's conception...avoids the taboo on tenderness on the one hand and undue pampering of the child on the other.[4]

In the excellent essay on Martin Buber as educator, Ernst Simon calls Buber's orientation an alternative to Kant's "system of maxims" and Dewey's "system of habits" and a permissive approach. Simon contends that the educated person pointed to by Buber is not beyond norms, but neither is he or she tied to them.[5] In essence, the theme of Simon's remarks is that the rejecting of both permissive and authoritative models of education is fundamental to an understanding of Buber's contribution to education.[6]

Although Buber voiced a dislike for clear epistemologies or in this case systematic pedagogies,[7] I believe his work does announce an organized philosophical underpinning for dialogue in the classroom. The remainder of the paper details Buber's approach to education as an alternative to the above mentioned extremes. Part One of the paper discusses Buber's method of association with students and Part Two describes his vision of what constitutes the educated person.

INVITING DIALOGUE IN THE CLASSROOM

Buber's relentless pursuit of an alternative to individualistic and authoritative models in education in no way dampened his appreciation of personal uniqueness; in fact, he saw such uniqueness as the necessary humanizer of the mass or the collective. The recent movie, Reds, strikes this chord with vigor in its display of the extremes present in the Russian revolution, in which loyalty to party took precedence over all other relationship ties. Arthur Koestler has addressed a similar concern in Darkness at Noon, in which "revolutionary ethics" relegate all to the collective cause.

Buber's rejection of individualism, and simultaneous affirmation of human uniqueness as a necessary protection from the danger of the collective spirit may sound like mere semantics. However, the affirmation of uniqueness as distinct from individualism is important to Buber's pedagogy. He saw the dangers of individualism and collectivism as controllable only by the uniqueness of one's person answering the needs of the historical moment. The following paraphrase of an Hasidic tale is offered by Maurice Friedman in this context of uniqueness without individualism.

> When Rabbi Noah, Rabbi Mordecai's son, assumed the succession after his father's death, his disciples noticed that there

> were a number of ways in which he conducted himself differently from his father, and asked him about this. 'I do just as my father did,' he replied. 'He did not imitate, and I do not imitate.'[8]

Buber believed that human uniqueness is discovered in response to the needs of the particular moment. He would find some kinship with the current emphasis on phenomenology in communication studies. For he did not accept the "reified" view of the situation that broadcasts the appropriate response to the participant; in addition, he rejected the notion that uniqueness is "in the person." Rather, he conceptualized a unique response as the result of the transaction between person and situation. The situation affects the person and the person affects what is appropriate for the situation.[9] A unique response, for Buber, cannot be analyzed out of its connectedness to both the situation and the person.

In teaching, Buber encouraged the transaction between situation, in this case educational concepts with their trappings, and the student. The result was frequently differences of opinion on interpretation because of the transactional nature of this approach. He affirmed the inevitable uniqueness of interpretation even in the midst of confrontation between himself and the student. He saw the allowance of uniqueness in interpretation as fundamental, if dialogue is to be given birth in the classroom. This section further explores elements of Buber's invitation of dialogue in the classroom: the "narrow ridge" philosophy of education, role responsibilities between teacher and student, and "inclusion," more commonly referred to as "experiencing the other side of the relationship."

The Narrow Ridge

The notion of the "narrow ridge" is the cornerstone of Martin Buber's philosophy. It is this concept that provides an alternative to extremes in

pedagogical theory, according to Buber in Between Man and Man. Buber states that he often summarizes his position with friends as a narrow ridge philosophy.[10] Maurice Friedman, a leading translator and interpreter of Buber's work, concurs with the central importance of the narrow ridge in Buber's philosophy.

> Perhaps no other phrase so aptly characterizes the quality and significance of Martin Buber's life and thought as the one of the 'narrow ridge.' It expresses not only the 'holy insecurity' of his existentialist philosophy but also the 'I-Thou,' or dialogical philosophy which he formulated as a genuine alternative to the insistent either-or's of our age. Buber's 'narrow ridge' is no 'happy middle' which ignores the reality of paradox and contradiction in order to escape from the suffering they produce. It is rather a paradoxical unity of what one usually understands only as alternatives--I and Thou, love and justice, dependence and freedom...good and evil, unity and duality.[11]

1. Freedom Within Limits. Buber's commitment to the narrow ridge in education is nowhere clearer than in his understanding of freedom. Buber had a great love of freedom, but he did not trust it, as is recorded in The Way of Response.

> Freedom--I love its flashing face: it flashes forth from the darkness and dies away, but it has made the heart invulnerable. I am devoted to it, I am always ready to join in the fight for it...I give my left hand to the rebel and my right to the heretic: forward! But I do not trust them. They know how to die, but that is not enough. I love freedom, but I do not believe in it.[12]

Buber's distrust of freedom is linked to his understanding of humanness as situated in a given historical circumstance. Buber would agree with Gadamer, Heisenberg, and Heidegger in their investigations asserting the impossibility of standing above historical circumstance. However, Buber would affirm the possibility of discovering freedom within the constraints of historical circumstance.[13]

The story of "The Bound Man" by Ilse Aichinger provides an analogy for Buber's freedom within limits thesis. The story tells of a man who was

robbed, beaten, and then bound with rope and left on the side of the road in the course of his journey. When the man awakened, he was panic-stricken, as he found himself secured by bounds of rope. The man discovered that if he did not move on he would die in that forsaken location. Thus, the man began to experiment with movement while tied. As he practiced, he found a freedom never known before. Within the limits of the bonds or circumstance, the man was able to find mobility--an analogy for freedom tempered by historical circumstance.

Buber would agree with the thrust of the story, that freedom is rooted in the limits of historical situation. He would concur with Viktor Frankl, that the final freedom is one's response to unchangeable circumstance. A terminal disease can be met by writing a journal to assist others who face similar difficulty; or one could simply become bitter. In the end, our response to the inevitable is our final freedom.

In education between student and teacher, Buber translated this freedom within constraints approach by responding to genuine circumstances of disagreement between the student and himself. He did not believe in freedom announced by such educators as A. S. Neil in Summerhill; rather, Buber felt that the student must meet resistance to ideas when the disagreement is authentic. Yet Buber did not impose his ideas on the student in a dogmatic fashion either. The student had to meet his ideas, but not necessarily agree with them. The limits Buber adhered to, or what he called the line of demarcation, was an exposure to his ideas rooted in a refusal to force his opinion on them.

2. Propagandist and the Educator. In a classic essay, Martin Buber further detailed his understanding of the freedom within limits thesis, as he distinguished between the propagandist and the educator.[14] The propagandist imposes ideas that conform only to the instructor's perceptions without regard

for the student's insights and the educator encourages an idea to unfold in its unique form, according to the personhood of the student. Buber made his viewpoint clear to the student, but he felt that he violated the educational spirit if he did not allow a student to reject the material.

Buber warned that the notions of imposing and unfolding cannot be correlated with arrogance and humility, respectively. It is possible to be arrogant in the belief that one's view is superior and still adhere to an attitude of unfolding in the teacher/student exchange. This can occur if one is concerned not only with answers, but with the method employed to discover answers. Buber's seeming adherence to a democratic spirit is in agreement with the work of Thomas Nielsen and Paul Keller's inquiry into interpersonal ethics. Both would concur with Buber's rationale for adhering to a line of demarcation that attempts to limit propaganda.

Buber would give full reign to persuasion and argument rooted in concern for the personal uniqueness and well-being of one's opponent. He rejected attitudes of objectification or an interchangeability of person in favor of dialogical conflict, or what has been termed a caring confrontation. The moment concern for the other's welfare ceases and seeking the best solution emerges as secondary to winning the battle, the unfolding of dialogue has stopped and the imposition of a party line or propaganda has been given birth.

Buber would even say that one could win an argument, but lose the best solution. Perhaps, each human has on occasion fought against the other, even when convinced of the superiority of the other's words. Such situations result in pride motivating one's struggle, rather than the search for the most helpful answer. The attitude of an educator must embody the willingness to admit defeat, if the other's position is closer to truth. However, if the educator remains unconvinced, the struggle over ideas while affirming personhood must continue.

The following story summarizes Buber's position on propaganda in conversation.

> I had a friend whom I account one of the most considerable men of our age. He was a master of conversation, and he loved it: his genuineness as a speaker was evident. But once it happened that he was sitting with two friends and the three wives, and a conversation among the men soon developed into a duel between two of them (I was the third). The other 'dualist,' also a friend of mine, was of a noble nature; he too was a man of true conversation, but given more to objective fairness than to the play of the intellect, and a stranger to any controversy. The friend whom I have called a master of conversation did not speak with his usual composure and strength, but he scintillated, he fought, he triumphed. The dialogue was destroyed.[15]

3. Responsibility--Sign Sensitivity. Buber's view of education called for a responsibility between the student and teacher that did not impose answers from an outside force or allow the student's subjective wishes and interpretation to be imposed on the material. Imposition is usually viewed as forcing views on a weaker person, but imposition can also result from the stubborn following of one's own impulses in opposition to the needs of the moment. Buber was not adverse to viewing education, as well as life, as sometimes requiring one to do an unpleasant and difficult task. Buber offered a philosophy of sign sensitivity[16] and responsibility as a third alternative to the extremes of blind obedience to tradition and the following of individual impulses.

The sign phenomenon occurs in the ontological realm of the "between," according to Buber. The "between" is an appropriate metaphor, because it rejects extremes of viewing communicative meaning as happening inside people ("the meaning is inside the person") and seeing meaning imposed from an outside source, represented by those who quote Marx or Biblical material as fact relevant to every situation without modification. For Buber, the realm of the "between" was a concrete reality where one was addressed by signs that emerged between him and another or an event. He believed that every

human being was addressed by signs, but they are frequently ignored. Only in the act of dialogue is one open to the significance of signs and is willing to act upon them.[17]

To be sensitive to signs, one must know one's own tradition, while being open to the demands of the unique moment.[18] In education, this approach can be translated into knowing the rules and methods of a teaching style and institution, but being open to breaking such tradition if necessary. The importance of signs is that they inform us of how to modify or alter our training to meet the unique moment. Such a statement may appear subjective at a glance, but Buber would reject such an interpretation. He would concur with Michael Polanyi about the inevitability of personal participation, but such participation must be tempered with the demands of the moment and the historically situated context.

Sign sensitivity has been experienced by most persons when in a "deep" and "special" form of conversation that goes beyond the technical talk of our era and the monological conversation of "me-ism." Such sharing, called dialogue by Buber, represents a willingness to stand one's own ground while being open to the other's view. It requires confirming the other, even in disagreement. It may necessitate saying or not saying what is desired by oneself or the other; rather, one speaks what is demanded by the situation, which is uniquely given birth by the ongoing transaction. Buber believed that signs are so concrete that in a transaction, at times, it seems as if a sign is held up saying, "This is the needed comment even though one or both of you may not like the message."[19]

Buber felt the goal of education was to sensitize the person to the address, call, or signs of the situation. To him responsibility was the courage to respond to the call. One's interpretation of what is needed by the situation is guided by tradition; thus, the teaching of classic material

is mandated, while the student is encouraged to adapt the material to the unique demands of the situation. Buber's blend of tradition and sensitivity tempered by the demands of the historical situation is captured in an article on Buber's approach to adult education in Israel.[20]

Buber felt it was the responsibility of the educator to impart the best of science, research, and tradition in such a fashion that it could be modified to meet the demands of the concrete moment. As Maurice Friedman describes, one must respond to signs that emerge in the tension between tradition and the uniqueness of the situation.

> Only when we have three elements--our personal uniqueness, the will to be open, and holding the tension with tradition--is there a meaningful dynamic. We must fight and contend with tradition in order to make an honest witness to our own uniqueness and to all the absurdity and incongruity that has entered our lives.[21]

The student of the signs of address will modify tradition and, at times, ignore his or her own impulses in order to honestly answer the call of the historical situation. Ultimately, tradition is necessary, but not fundamental; training, for Buber, must be in constant tension with the demands of the historical moment. He rejected a cookbook approach to education, while knowing the rules. He rejected giving sanction to subjective impulses, while recognizing the vital importance of personal uniqueness. In sum, responsibility to signs calls for a walking of the narrow ridge between secure knowledge and personal interpretation of the needs of the moment.

Role Responsibilities

Martin Buber affirmed the importance and necessity of role responsibilities in the educative task. He frequently stated that the ground rule of an educator is to meet the needs of educating the student, not necessarily promoting a friendship. He was fearful that the focus of friendship could cloud one's sensitivity to what was required in educating

the student--particularly when the student is required to attempt an uncomfortable task.

Even though friendship was not Buber's goal, he never forgot the importance and uniqueness of each of his pupils. Buber's affirmation of the student in the one-up/one-down relationship is clearly announced in his understanding of trust and "experiencing the other side of the relationship" as fundamental to education. He felt that lack of trust lessened the possibility of learning. Buber recognized the need for healthy doubting pointed to by Descartes, but he felt the tendency to emphasize the "psyche" in our time had encouraged a constant search for a hidden motive, resulting in an absence of trust. The quest of trying to discover what the other "really means" is termed a form of "existential mistrust"--a distrust of the existence between persons. Again, Buber recognized the need to doubt occasionally, but he felt such distrust had grown to epidemic proportions.

> It is important to perceive clearly how the specifically modern mistrust differs from the ancient mistrust, which is apparently inherent in the human being and which has left its mark in all cultures. There have always been countless situations in which a ... fellow-man is seized with the doubt...that demands that he suspect the other... [However, today the] main task in my intercourse with my fellow-man becomes more and more, whether in terms of individual psychology or of sociology, to see through and unmask him.[22]

Buber, and other current writers, such as Victor Frankl, see the persistent effort to unmask hidden motives as destructive to human communication. In the teacher/student relationship, the task of the educator is to ascertain when to suspect a comment and when to accept it on face value. As Gordon Allport suggested, we need a radical "new" technique for finding out why people do what they do--Ask them! Again, Buber sought to walk the narrow ridge as an educator; he rejected the impulse to regularly search for a hidden motive and he also recognized that not all speech is true. The task

of the educator is to tell the two apart and respond to them accordingly.

Buber offered no technique for determining when to unmask a motive and when to trust a comment at face value. However, it seems that the ability to make such judgments separates those likely to develop significant and honest relationships from others. His only clue for how to make such determinations rests with the concept of "exeriencing the other side of the relationship" or what Buber also calls "inclusion."

This notion of "experiencing the other side of the relationship" is often confused with the notion of empathy. But Buber makes it clear that he does not see the two terms as interchangeable. Buber conceives empathy as the giving up of one's own ground in order to experience the other's world. In the psychological world, Carl Rogers comes closest to Buber's position when he describes the effort of experiencing the other's world "as if" it were one's own--emphasizing the need to keep individual identity. However, even this approach does not pin-point Buber's orientation. Roger's view includes one's subjective view getting in touch with another's subjective world.[23] Buber sought a description of encounter that was not rooted in subjective or objective standards, but required one's perception to be affected by both the reality of the other and the interpretive world of the on-looker.

Philosophically, the notion of inclusion is akin to the phenomenological concept of intentionality. Edmund Husserl's terminology of intentionality implies the connectedness of life that rejects the Cartesian split of mind/body--noemis and noema. The above notions cannot be confused with subject/object, but must be seen as labels for an interconnected event. To touch is to simultaneously be touched; to speak is to simultaneously listen; one is not a subject affecting an object; rather, noema and noemis are interconnected actions that are present prior to our imposed subject/object division. Inclusion is grounded in recognition that as one acts, one must

simultaneously listen to how the situation is acting on oneself in the moment. In short, Buber advocated a responding to existence as it simultaneously addressed him. The distinction between inclusion and empathy may seem insignificant and "mere" semantics. But it is a fundamental distinction--inclusion is a description of a world-view at odds with psychological premises, as originally detailed by Husserl in his description of intentionality. Thus, for Buber the primary educational goal is not a psychological task to know oneself, but to respond with all one's being to the call of the moment. Who one is cannot be discussed without reference to the situation. Both noema and noemis are necessary in the exchange. One cannot speak of great people without discussing moments of great need. Churchill without the tides of war or Gandhi without the presence of English domination could not have made the same contributions. The goal of education, as the next section details, is to sensitize the individual to the needs and demands of the current situation and encourage a response with the full being that is rooted in the best classical and contemporary information.

CHARACTER BUILDING

Buber contended that it requires people of great character to absorb the "best" information available and then be called upon to modify that information when circumstance dictates. The shaping and maturing of this educated character is encouraged by his understanding of the characteristics of the whole person and his reliance on questioning as the most concrete part of his pedagogical style.

The essence of the great character that Buber views as the hope of the educational process is described succinctly by Cohen.

> Buber does not mean to say that the great character stands outside of norms. He contends, rather, that the behest of true norm never assumes the guise of rigid rule, and that its fulfillment never becomes routine habit...Although Buber keeps aloof from all rigid and binding doctrines and upholds, instead, the principle of personally determined choice, he does not consider himself to exempt from the task of bringing the values to the attention of his students: from introducing his students to the concept of value itself, from proposing alternatives, from submitting these to critical examination, from enumerating specific examples of personal choice.[24]

Buber's hope as an educator is that the product of a quality education will stand above the crowd or collective and ask the difficult and the necessary questions. He would agree with Fromm and Ellul that the struggle of our century is that we ask, "Can something be done?" rather than the more essential question, "Should something be done?" Again Buber is suggesting that the goal of education is to know the norms and the opinion of the collective, but to be able to modify and even reject that view when deemed necessary in the moment of decision.

Buber's educated person of great character is an ethical decision-maker, although no two such persons may make the same ethical decisions. Buber did not desire uniformity; he sought a willingness to ask the tough ethical decisions of why, should, and ought.

Perhaps the thought of such a person brings to mind the image of excess zeal. Buber conceived of this possibility in a favorable light. In fact, Buber would invite passion and zeal into the educational activity. He was not afraid of conviction. However, he sought to aid persons in the style of their passion so as not to cut themselves off from new information. Buber called for the confirmation of persons, even when convinced that the other is wrong. This confirmation is rooted in openness to the other's view to the extent that one's opinion may change, if convinced of the opposing position as superior. But if one is not persuaded, one maintains one's own position.

In short, Buber believed in a conviction buffered by an openness to "new" information that could change one's position.

> Sometimes that dialogue can only mean standing one's ground in opposition to him, witnessing for what one believes in the face of his hostile reaction of it. Yet it can never mean being unconcerned for how he sees it or careless of the validity of his standing where he does. We must confirm him even as we oppose him, not in his 'error' but in his right to oppose us, in his existence as a human being whom we value even in opposing.[25]

Buber felt that the person of great character must be willing to modify or even reject tradition, if appropriate for the situation. He/she must seek to confirm others by listening openly to contrary viewpoints. Buber did not believe this ethical stance could be taught directly. He felt the best approach was through questioning. He wanted students to examine "taken-for-granted" societal conventions. Buber wanted to encourage the development of character education with the use of stories, examples, spontaneous questions, and the ever-present tension of tradition and the need of the moment.[26] For Buber questioning was an act of opening up the possibilities that might go unseen in the activity of memorization or tradition acceptance. He, like Gadamer, recognized the blinders put on by one's historical situatedness and the need to question for further insight.[27] In short, the person of great character must learn to question tradition and modify it to meet the demands of the current hour.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SPEECH COMMUNICATION INSTRUCTION

Clearly, Martin Buber does not offer a technique we can easily duplicate in our classrooms. If one attempts to approach his pedagogy in search of a clear model, frustration is sure to follow. The value of Buber's implications for education do not reside in specific proposals; his contribution lies more in the area of attitudes about teaching. His

orientation is in agreement with Darnell emphasizing "getting back to the basics" of the teacher/student relationship, not just the three R's.[28] Also, Buber's philosophy is a call for creative thinking that seeks alternative suggestions to opposing extreme positions. His narrow ridge philosophy requires one to walk between the extremes of tradition versus change and confirmation versus confrontation--Buber's thesis is that most quality answers do not reside in simple black and white categories, but in the innovation of third alternatives.

In addition, some of Buber's concerns may be helpful for Speech Communication educators, as we move into a more "vocational thrust" of career tracts and increased concern with the marketable possibilities of our students. Perhaps Buber would caution us to walk a narrow ridge between concern for job placement of our students and simultaneous concern for their ability to ask the difficult and fundamental ethical questions. This narrow ridge philosophy could, perhaps, encourage the student to be an ethical decision-maker while pursuing a pragmatic career focus. Such a student might not conform to any one ethical system, but would be able to ask ethical questions. He or she would ask "Should it be done?" as well as, "Can it be done?"

Buber would contend that we must ask tough ethical questions unless we are certain the answers to all problems have already been discovered. He invites an ethical stance that seeks to contribute to the well-being of self and others. Such an orientation is in agreement with many of my teachers and colleagues in Speech Communication, who entered the field with similar goals. In fact, some of my teachers shared in reflection that one strong motivation for entering Speech came from a desire to "save the world" with the proper use of rhetoric, as inspired by Churchill and Roosevelt. Some of my contemporary colleagues have stated that they entered the Speech Communication field with a desire to "save part of the world" through interpersonal communication.

However, presently, I seldom hear colleagues talking about saving any portion of the world; now the talk centers around adapting to the current fiscal and enrollment challenges. The rapid proliferation of business communication courses is often justified by the need for a strong FTE base and a response to the pragmatic mood of the students. As Christopher Lasch has suggested, our era is replacing the concept of growth with the hope of just surviving.

Let there be no mistake that I support the move into the vocational arena. I, too, have a survival instinct. But I support such pragmatics with reservation, as do many of my colleagues committed to the values of a liberal arts approach to our discipline. The words of Claude Kantner over thirty years ago echo my hesitation.

> The old emphasis on form and beauty rapidly gave way to new emphasis on the personal, utilitarian, market-place value of good speech. In attempting to name this period I have sometimes wondered whether to call it the...Commercial Age in Speech Education...[29]

The warning of Kantner and the value of Buber's educational system is to question the tradition and to encourage ethical decision-making. As we prepare our students for a tight job market, Buber would suggest we walk the narrow ridge of preparing our students to compete, while simultaneously encouraging them to stand above the crowd and ask the tough questions of why, should, and ought.

REFERENCES

[1]See, for example, the following single and/or co-authored contributions, "A Survey of the Use of Proficiency Examinations in Speech in Fifty Colleges and Universities," The Speech Teacher, VIII (1959), pp. 242-245; "Major Findings in Listening in the Past Ten Years," Journal of Communication, X(1960), pp. 29-38; "A Modest Proposal for Listening Training," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVIII (1962), pp. 395-399; "The Study of Face-to-Face International Decision-Making," Journal of Communication, XIV (1963), pp. 67-76; "An Interpersonal Ethic for Communication," Journal of Communication, XVIII (1968); Monologue to Dialogue: An Exploration of Interpersonal Communication, 2nd edition, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976); and "Communication-Conflict Predisposition: Development of a Theory and an Instrument," Human Relations, 34 (1981), pp. 1103-1117. In addition, Dr. Keller is currently researching two other books, one on conflict and another describing the implications of Martin Buber's dialogue in the establishment of human community.

[2]Aubrey Hodes, Martin Buber: An Intimate Portrait (New York: The Viking Press, 1971), p. 211.

[3]Not all scholars of Buber's educational methods affirm his ability to live his suggested dialogical pedagogy. See for example, Haim Gordon, "Did Martin Buber Realize His Educational Thought?" Teachers College Record, 81 (1980) pp. 385-394. Space does not permit a full critique of the Gordon piece, but some thoughts need to be part of one's reading of the work. Does Gordon deal with the historical and cultural limitations placed on behavior during Buber's time in Germany and Israel? Does Gordon understand the importance of the narrow ridge and the democratic spirit that undergirds his work? Does Gordon understand that Buber rejects technique and dogmatic descriptions of what behavior is dialogical and what is not? Because Gordon does not address the above questions in the article, his analysis is interesting, but suspect in my eyes.

[4]Maurice Friedman, "Martin Buber's Philosophy of Education," Educational Theory, VI (1956), p. 100.

[5]Ernst Simon, "Martin Buber the Educator," The Philosophy of Martin Buber, eds. Paul Arthur Schilpp and Maurice Friedman (La Salle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Co., 1967), p. 548.

[6]This point is elaborated in depth by F. H. Hillard, "A Re-Examination of Buber's Address on Education," British Journal of Educational Studies, 21 (1973), pp. 40-49.

[7]It is no small point that Buber rejected a clear well formulated epistemology. He felt that any too well described approach or model was likely to become a static technique relegating the approach to an I-It or

monological orientation. Instead, he favored a more flexible discussion of educational approaches that pointed in directions that suggested possibilities, but could only be given life through the uniqueness of the individual teacher. This point is made quite clearly by Haim Gordon, "Would Martin Buber Endorse the Buber Model?" Educational Theory, pp. 215-223. "...Buber's most important legacy will be fulfilled when teachers understand that their role is not and cannot be confined to working within a model. True education demands much more. A model confines education to behavior, skill, intellect, while I am suggesting that the educator, inspired by Buber's thought, interact within another realm of existence: the I-Thou, knowledge through relationship, genuine encounters." (223)

[8]Maurice Friedman, The Hidden Human Image (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1974), p. 5.

[9]How we are situated in situations is a major contribution of William Dilthey and carried on by more contemporary scholars, such as Martin Heidegger and Hans-Georg Gadamer. In a more psychologized view of situation, Kenneth Boulding suggests that we are situated in time, space, personal relationships, our environment, and emotions. For the purposes of this paper, situation represents overt and subtle influences that permit us to label one situation as different from another. Transaction is present in the interpretation and sensitivity to these influences, resulting in different people experiencing different interpretations of the "same empirical event." Thus, surfaces the troublesome problem of dealing with the validity and verifiability of such interpretations. Due to the scope of this paper, such an analysis is not possible. But the author does want to point the reader to an on-going debate between Gadamer and Betti in regard to this issue in interpretation.

[10]Martin Buber, Between Man and Man (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1972), p. 124.

[11]Maurice Friedman, Martin Buber: The Life of Dialogue, 3rd edition, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976), p. 3.

[12]N. N. Glatzer, ed., The Way of Response: Martin Buber Selections From His Writings (New York: Schocken Books, 1966), p. 166.

[13]Adir Cohen, "The Question of Values and Value Education in the Philosophy of Martin Buber," Teachers College Record, 80 (1979), pp. 763-766.

[14]Martin Buber, "Elements of the Interhuman," The Knowledge of Man, ed. Maurice Friedman (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 72-88.

[15]Ibid., pp. 87-88.

[16]The everyday nature of signs, with our reluctance to take note of them, is described by Buber, Between Man and Man, pp. 10-13.

[17]Buber did not believe that one could be in dialogue at all times. At least some of our training in education must consist of memorizing basic concepts of one's discipline. Such learning is I-It or monologue and quite necessary; Buber did not oppose such activity. However, he warned against attempting to make dialogue into a technique, for the result will be an I-It formulation. He contended that the teacher led by a dialogical orientation should not rely too heavily on teaching techniques. Rather, one must be open to modifying a procedure to meet the demands of the moment. See for example the discussion provided by Brian V. Hill, "Martin Buber, Jacques Martain, Reinhold Niebuhr: Modern Religious and Educational Thinkers," Intellect, 102 (1973), p. 193.

[18]Although it is beyond the realm of this paper, Buber's understanding of signs is related to the notion of the "hermeneutic circle." Perhaps the most current hermeneutic philosopher to shed light on Buber's ontology through their own inquiry is Hans-Georg Gadamer. However, for the sake of brevity, it will have to suffice to say that responding to signs is not a subjective, nor an objective task. It is rather a knowing of tradition and a willingness to modify it when one's personal interpretation of a situation calls for a change.

[19]A word of caution is needed here, for Buber does not reify the situation. Situation for Buber cannot be discussed without an understanding of the "intentional" connectedness between person and event. Thus, each person will see a somewhat different sign, due to the transactional nature of person and situation. For further clarification, see the phenomenological implications of dialogue in Stephan Strasser, The Idea of Dialogal Phenomenology (Pittsburg: Duquesne University Press, 1969), pp. 12-22 and pp. 55-58.

[20]Joshua Weinstein, "The Philosophy of Martin Buber: As The Keystone of Adult Education in Israel," Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 2 (1979), pp. 8-9, 32, and 34-35.

[21]Maurice Friedman, Touchstones of Reality: Existential Trust and The Community of Peace (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1974), p. 340.

[22]Martin Buber, "Hope for This Hour," Pointing the Way, ed. Maurice Friedman (Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1971), p. 223.

[23]A tracing of the origins and implications of empathy can be found in a paper by Ronald C. Arnett and Gordon Nakagawa, "An Ethical Alternative to Empathic Listening: An Existential/Phenomenological Approach." Presented at the International Listening Association, Denver, Colorado, March 1981.

[24]Cohen, p. 761.

[25]Friedman, The Hidden Human Image, p. 368.

[26]Simon, p. 566.

[27]Hans-Georg Gadamer, Truth and Method (New York: Continuum Publishing Corporation, 1975), p. 266.

[28]Donald Darnell, "Some 'Basics' to Get Back to: A Transactional Perspective on Teaching-Learning," Communication Education, XXVII (1978), pp. 277-285.

[29]Claude Kantner, "Social Responsibility in Speech Education," Southern Speech Communication Journal, XIV (1948), pp. 67-74.